DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 597 CS 506 382

AUTHOR Farrell, Amy E.
TITLE "Ms." in Transition: A Change of Skin or a Change of Heart?
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Feminism; Ideology; Journalism; Mass Media Use; Media Research; *Periodicals; *Popular Culture; *Social Influences; Social Integration
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Hegemony; Feminist Criticism; Feminist Press; Magazine Covers; *Ms Magazine; *Womens Magazines

ABSTRACT

Changing from a non-profit foundation to a for-profit corporation, "Ms." magazine recently passed through a transitional phase, transforming its image to attract more advertisers. Four issues published after the fifteenth anniversary issue, when the new image was introduced, illumine both the hegemony of patriarchal capitalism and the contradictions and tensions within it. While asserting that only their "skin" (i.e. cover representation, size, and format) would change, "Ms." diverts attention away from the significance of the connections between its structural and formal changes. The attempt of "Ms." to be seen as a "commercial success," a marketing opportunity rather than a cause, indicates the ability of the marketplace to reincorporate resistance into its system. Yet the same competition that forced "Ms." to be reincorporated is also the strongest indicator that "Ms." was successful at forcing the marketplace to expand its hegemonic definitions of meaning. Readers, commenting on the old "Ms." covers, current "Ms." covers, and the November 1987 covers of "Self," "New Woman," and "Mademoiselle," noted that the new "Ms." covers looked less political and more similar to other women's magazines. Yet "Ms." has opened space within the dominant male culture even as it closed some traditionally political representations. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299597

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Amy Farrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

MS. in TRANSITION: A CHANGE OF SKIN OR A CHANGE OF HEART?

Amy E. Farrell
25 May 1988
Program in American Studies
and the
Center for Advanced Feminist Studies
University of Minnesota

submitted for

Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Status of Women Committee

CS506382

Ms. in Transition: A Change in Skin or a Change in Heart?

Recently Ms. magazine passed through a transitional phase, changing from a non-profit foundation to a for-profit corporation owned by Fairfax Limited, an Australian firm. Patricia Carbine and Gloria Steinem explained that for Ms. to survive it needed to attract more advertisers and have adequate financial backing. Neither of these criteria were possible as long as advertisers and potential owners perceived Ms. as a "cause" rather than a "market opportunity."(1) To change this perception, Ms. introduced its new "upbeat" image shortly after its fifteenth anniversary issue. Announcing the changes in the September 1987 issue, editor Suzanne Braun Levine explained that it was "time for a change--not of the muscles and bones and heart--but of the skin, the way we present those core assets to the world." Ms. would now use more color and stylish new typeface; features would be more fast-paced to "move to the beat of TV information." In addition, each cover would feature the face of some "spirited" woman who embodied the "great burst of optimism among women today." (2)

These specific changes in image were only temporary; Fairfax made a number of changes in format, size, cover representation, and features when it presented its first issue in February 1988. What is significant about the transition period prior to the turnover in ownership, however, is that Ms. editors felt it was necessary to change its image and to blend with the many other "liberated" women's magazines (Self, New Woman) to attract a potential owner and more advertisers.(3) In this paper I will

examine the ways in which this transition period--particularly the four issues after the fifteenth anniversary issue--illumine both the hegemony of patriarchal capitalism as well as the contradictions and tensions within it. In particular, I will explore the significance of a semi-marginal group--Ms. magazine--making a bid to "go commercial" or, rather, to be more closely centered in the mainstream. Rather than dismissing Ms. as selling out--as Maurine Christopher does when she suggests that "women will have to look elsewhere for direction" (4)--I think it is essential to recognize the significance of the move and the complex cultural struggles that result from it. Using Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses and Gramsci's and Hall's theories of hegemony, I will examine the political tensions and contradictions inherent in this transition of ownership and economic status. Finally, using both reader responses and semiotic theory, I will focus on the struggle for representation and meaning that takes place on the covers of Ms. during this transitional phase.

The work of Louis Althusser, particularly his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," sheds light on the complex relationship between the changing economic structure of Ms. and its changed image. Althusser argues that three levels of practices make up society--the economic, the political, and the ideological. By economic he refers to the nature and relations of production; by political he identifies social relations and organization; by ideological he describes the systems of representation, how meanings are produced by and for individuals. Each of these levels is relatively autonomous, but they do work

in tension with each other and the economic is, in the end, the "final determinant." (5)

Althusser's theory is useful for studying this transitional phase of Ms. for a number of reasons. Most obviously, it provides a framework for examining the connections between the economic imperatives that insisted Ms. change its image and the changes in representation that occurred. Because Althusser emphasized the relative autonomy of the ideological, his theory helps explain the importance of representation and how it "overdetermines" the naturalness of the economic and social practices. Finally, Althusser's discussion of how the subject makes meaning in relation to her material and social world give us a starting point from which to understand how Ms. inscribes preferred meanings for readers while readers may subvert or modify those meanings as they construct their own understanding of Ms.

Before turning to a discussion of the meanings inscribed in Ms.--particularly on the covers-- I want to focus on the way Ms. worked to make the change in image and the change in economic status seem natural, inevitable, and unrelated. When the editor Suzanne Levine introduced the "Ms. of the Future" in the September issue, neither the change from non-profit status to for-profit status nor the incentive for commercial success was mentioned. Instead, Levine focused solely on the changes in format, which resulted, she explained, during a reevaluation while editors prepared the fifteenth anniversary issue:

> Who hasn't awakened one day realizing that it is time to cut her long hair short, learn a new skill, or meet some new people? Something to fulfill a great need for a change, a kind of impatience that often heralds an exhilarating period of growth. It can strike at any age and is not a reflection of happiness or unhappiness, but is more like shedding a psychic skin and emerging as the same person in a revamped form. That happened to Ms. in the process of evaluating our first 15 years for the July/August Anniversary Issue, we realized that in many ways it was time for a change--not of the muscles and bones and heart--but of the skin, the way we present those core issues to the world. (6)

Other than her reference to the "exhilarating period of growth," which probably suggests the expansion expected under commercial ownership, Levine was silent about any planned structural changes. In this silence and in the assertion that only their "skin" will change, leaving what is substantive and meaningful untouched, Ms. diverts attention away from the significance of the connections between its structural and formal changes. Their emphasis on "solutions," successful women, and an upbeat feeling are explained as natural attempts to catch up with the aesthetics of the 80s rather than as marketing attempts to sell the magazine to a potential owner and to advertisers.

Of course, when the editorial came out in the September issue, Levine, or the editorial board of Ms. for that matter, may not have known that the magazine would soon be a for-profit organization. Four months prior to this September issue, however, Steinem and Carbine gave an interview for the New York Times in which they announced their decision to attract more readers and advertisers and to look for a new owner. In this May 1987 interview they argued that Ms. didn't have enough capital to promote itself aggressively to advertisers and potential readers.

A new owner with strong financial backing, they explained, could increase both circulation and advertising. While speaking to the "business world" Steinem and Carbine also made the connection between the structural and formal changes clear: they described the new "stylish" Ms. as one that would be attractive to a broader range of advertisers and readers. (7)

While this New York Times article makes Ms.'s new image seem to be a purely economic decision, the editorial introducing the changes in format makes it seem to be a purely aesthetic judgment. Clearly, however, the change is prompted by aesthetic and, ultimately, economic factors. The dominant representations of women in current popular women's magazines dictate that Ms. portray a similar "upbeat" feeling if it wishes to be in dialogue, or, rather, in competition with them. The economic dependence on advertisers dictates that Ms. be in competition with the other women's magazines. Yet because these connections are discounted, the explanations for Ms.'s changes, the "naturalness" of the positive representations of women overdetermine, as Althusser explains, the "naturalness" and inevitability of the economic structure.

While Althusser's theory allows for an understanding of the connections between the economic status of Ms. and the codes of representation it presents, I think it is the theories of hegemony that best explain the struggle that is going on within Ms.. John Fiske explains that hegemonic theory (as articulated by Gramsci and Hall) "posits a constant contradiction between ideology and the social experience of the subordinate that makes this interface into an inevitable site of ideological struggle."

(8) Culture is itself a site of contestation, where dominant and subordinate groups struggle for definitions of meaning. Dominant groups will attempt to "naturalize" those experiences and cultural significations that serve their own interests, thus "naturalizing" the entire system. Subordinate groups, whose experiences do not resonate with those of the dominant groups, will resist or negotiate these dominant ideologies. To maintain the power that it has acquired, dominant groups must attempt to win over the subordinate groups, often by expanding their hegemony to incorporate the ideas and experiences--meanings--of the subordinate goups. While this process illustrates how the dominant groups are able to stay in power, it also illustrates how incomplete and contradictory that power is.

Ms.'s bid to be seen as a "commercial success," a marketing opportunity rather than a cause, surely indicates the ability of the marketplace to reincorporate resistance into its system. The president of Fairfax (United States), Sandra Yates, expressed this power of patriarchal capitalism to turn feminism into a market when she explained their decision to buy Ms.:

> It's a title that has a lot of potential for growth, given the sufficient resources. That has always been a problem for the people at Ms. We feel there is a market for a feminist publication and we will be looking to grow. And it made significant business sense to us. (9)

Ironically, however, the same competition that forced Ms. to be reincorporated is also the strongest indicator that Ms. has indeed been successful at forcing the marketplace to expand its hegemonic definitions of meaning. That is, Ms. needed to find a new, financially strong owner because it was losing its share of

the marketplace: other, newer magazines, like Self and New Woman were addressing some of the same issues and attracting some of the same readers as Ms. Even older, more traditional women's magazines began encompassing a more feminist approach. The 50th anniversary issue of Woman's Day, for instance, featured decade by decade women's history and included only articles and illustrations by women. (10) While this proliferation of magazines with a feminist, or at least pro-woman, stance indicates the power of patriarchal capitalism to turn oppositional strands into a market channel, it also clearly indicates the potential power of readers to make the marketplace answerable to them. Before Ms. there was little space within the New York publishing industry for mass-media magazines that spoke to the needs and desires of millions of women. After Ms. pushed open a space within that industry, however, enough magazines found themselves able to respond to women to such an extent that Ms. found itself in competition with them.

Clearly, then, the persistence and success of Ms. has forced the mass-media publishing industry to expand its definition of what is acceptable and what women want in a women's magazine. This struggle for meaning and for definitions of acceptability is a continual process between dominant and subordinate groups. For Ms., in a transitional phase between owners, changing from a non-profit foundation to a for-profit industry, this struggle was particularly highlighted. While much of this struggle goes on within the magazine, and, I suspect, between and among readers, advertisers, and editors, what I am concerned with here is the initial struggle for meaning that takes place on the cover.

What we see on the covers of Ms. signifies to readers and to advertisers what Ms. is. Particularly in this transitional phase, when the "meaning" of Ms. was in flux, the initial struggle for representation, for how Ms. presented itself to the world and how readers, in turn, made meaning of that representation, took place on the cover. Recent critical work with semiotic theory recognizes that "the distribution of power in society is paralleled by the distribution of meanings in texts, and that struggles for social power are paralleled by semiotic struggles for meaning." (11) That is, just as we see a struggle for power and for meaning within the magazine industry as a whole, we also see a struggle for power within the photographic representation of Ms. on its cover. Analysis of the covers of Ms. involves, as Fiske explains, a "close reading of the signifiers of the text--that is, its physical presence--but recognizes that the signifieds exist not in the text itself, but extratextually, in the myths, countermyths, and ideology of the culture." (12) Reading a cover, then, requires both analysis of the elements that make up the representation as well as an understanding of how different readers construct meanings from the signifieds.

After their fifteenth anniversary issue, Ms. came out with four remarkably similar covers for their next four issues. Each pictures a close-up of some successful woman's face. She is smiling, looking directly at us, and her head is resting on her hand, or, in the case of Nadja Salerno-Sonnenberg, on her violin. The covers, in order from September to December, present Tracey

Ullman, a TV comedian; Salerno-Sonnenberg, a violinist; Cam Starrett, a top executive at Avon; and Bonnie Allen, a writer for Ms. On the top left corner of the cover is the Ms. logo with the phrase "For a Better World" underneath it; in the top right corner is a headline about something in the issue; along the left side is a list of the major stories; and in the bottom right hand corner are a few lines identifying the woman on the cover. None of the women look like each other, nor are the kinds of work they do at all similar. Their pose and their position on the page make them, at first glance, seem almost interchangable, however.

For some cultural critics, I suspect that the recent decision to rigidify the representation of cover women would seem to demonstrate the power of the capitalist, mass-media magazine industry to incorporate a "cause" into a slick opportunity for selling magazines to consumers and consumers to advertisers. E. Ann Kaplan, discussing the common distinction made between "positive" and "negative" images of women, argues that "positive" images of women simply create a different standard by which to judge women; a positive image is of a woman who seems to be "autonomous, self-fulfilling, self-assertive, socially and financially 'sucessful'." Clearly, these positive images, according to Kaplan, reinforce the competition, individualism, and valorization of the masculine world that help to naturalize patriarchal capitalism. (13) Theresa de Lauretis, author of Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema, argues that a focus on positive images of women is a "measure of social legitimation" that allows for "commercial and ideological exploitation." (14) For both Kaplan and de Lauretis, then, these positive images on

the cover of Ms., these attempts to create a shero, work to the benefit of the capitalist patriarchal culture. They simply illustrate the power of the dominant, in this case patriarchal capitalism, to incorporate and subsume the differences and resistance posited by subordinate women.

While Kaplan's and de Lauretis' arguments are persuasive and important, I think that these "upbeat" covers, with the positive images of successful women, are more complicated than their arguments suggest. If, as Fiske argues, signifieds exist not in the text itself, but extratextually, then it is necessary to look at these covers in relation to other women's magazines, particularly those with which Ms. hopes to compete, and in relation to those Ms. covers previous to their "new image". In addition, to understand what (or rather how) these covers mean, it is necessary to understand what signifieds readers attach to the represented signifiers.

To compare these recent Ms. with other women's magazines I chose three different November 1987 magazines (Self, New Woman, and Mademoiselle) and a number of earlier Ms. covers: a 1986 cover featuring Richard Gere, a 1985 cover featuring the bottom half of a woman's face while she is taking the "new" birth-control pill, a 1984 cover picturing a pregnant woman in a flag (the headline: Whose Fetus is it Anyways?), a 1983 cover featuring a female gymnastic Olympic team, a 1977 cover picturing a group of women in a protest that may have been recorded by the FBI, and a 1976 cover picturing the face of a woman who had been beaten.

Rather than positioning myself as the "typical" or "ideal" feminist reader of Ms. I decided to interview a number of women to see how other readers did indeed "read" or "construct" the meanings of these transitional covers in relation to the older covers and the recent covers of Self, Mademoiselle, and New Woman. During the group interview I taped the responses and comments of five women, each of whom was white, college-educated, and in her mid-twenties. Certainly this interview was limited (in terms of the race, age, and education and number of participants) but I do think it indicates some of the complexity involved in reading the covers of mass-media women's magazines, particularly feminist or pro-woman magazines.

During the interview I asked readers to comment on the similarities and differences among the old Ms. covers, the current Ms. covers and the November covers of Self, New Woman, and Mademoiselle. Their initial reaction to the recent covers of Ms. was very negative. They suggested that the new Ms. covers were much less "political"; while the older covers reminded them of Newsweek, Time, or Mother Jones, they felt the new covers were much more similar to the current women's magazines. One reader commented, "It [the new Ms.] looks just like Good Housekeeping and it pisses me off." [In fact, most of the women remarked that the new covers reminded them of "older women's" magazines like Good Housekeeping or Ladies Home Journal rather than Self or New Woman; this makes sense because Ms. is concerned about the competition from Self and New Woman, but is also working to attract an "older" (post-30) audience. (15)]

As the readers asked me to flip back and forth between

slides of Ms. and slides of the other women's magazines, they began to modify the initial connection they had made between the two groups. Focusing many of their comments on the issue of power, they made sharp distinctions between the covers. The Mademoiselle cover, picturing a red-haired, blue-eyed, white woman with big, pouting, glossy lips and three satin bows tucked under her chin, drew the most laughter and the most anger. Readers commented that she looked like a "package", "pornographic", or that she had "just given somebody a blow job." One reader suggested that she looked like "an abused child" with "bruised" lips. For that reader, the headline "How to Make Up Your Lips" seemed especially ironic.

The Self cover, picturing a young white woman in a black sequined dress, drew a more positive response. Readers said she looked like "she could be dancing" and that she "wanted to party". Although she was wearing a sexy dress, she did not look as "seductive as [the woman on] Mademoiselle." Readers decided the woman on New Woman, who was standing with her hands on her hips and wearing a red suit and a "look that could kill", looked even more assertive than the woman on Self. They suggested she had that "come hither and I'll tear your clothes off" look. One reader explained, "It is about sexuality, but it's about [how] she is going to choose who it's going to be."

When comparing the new Ms. covers to the Mademoiselle, Self, and New Woman covers, readers felt that the most obvious distinction was that the women on Ms. were "not glamorous." Instead, they were older women, characters, "personalities". It

was extremely important to these readers that the Ms. women had an identity; that is, the cover was about them, not about their clothes or their make-up. The majority of readers comments, however, focused on the importance of the hand in the picture. Each of these covers, if you recall, features a woman who is resting her chin on her hand. Readers commented that this position made the woman look more "forthright", more "powerful" than the women in the other magazines. The women looked as though they were going to "hit someone," one reader said. Another suggested that the hand served as an "obstruction," pushing the reader away. A number of the readers commented that the pose was very male; indeed, the earlier Ms. cover of Richard Gere had him posing in a similar way. Whether this is indeed a male posture, or whether readers perceived it as male because of the power associated with it, it is clear that all the readers found these representations of women "less vulnerable" and "less pornographic" than the Self, New Woman, and Mademoiselle cover women.

Both Theresa de Lauretis and Laura Mulvey have written frequently and powerfully of the male gaze, of the way photography, cinema, and narrative are constructed so that a masculine subject "captures" a feminine object. The Mademoiselle cover is a striking example of this kind of representation. The Self and New Woman covers seem to play with this kind of portrayal; readers perceived the women on these covers as "having fun" but as still defined primarily by their heterosexual sexuality. For these readers, however, the Ms. covers seemed to be most resistant to the male gaze. We see only the

straightforward, smiling face; the hand obstructs any attempt the viewer might feel to reach in and touch, or grab, or capture the woman. While the nature of photography may still be one of capturing the "subject" it seems clear that the pose of the Ms. cover women complicates the viewer's gaze and denies the fulfillment of the photographer's desire to own the photographed.

Some may argue that these Ms. women obstruct the gaze simply because they have assumed a male posture, becoming, in fact, representations of men. Indeed, the readers' comments that Ullman, Salerno-Sonnenberg, Starrett, and Allen are in "very male" postures seem to confirm this. I would argue, however, that these cover women have not become men. Their lipstick, nail polish, earrings, eyeliner, and smiles all identify them as women. Ms. has "mixed up" the signifiers: these women clearly have all the typically feminine attributes and accoutrements, but they also have the powerful, obstructive "male" gesture to defend and support themselves. What I am suggesting is that these cover women combine male and female signifiers in an unexpected way; by blending masculine and feminine signifiers Ms. manages to be in dialogue with other women's magazines (i.e. the initial reaction that these were indeed similar to New Woman, Self, or Good Housekeeping) without giving up all resistance and power.

A concluding comment made by one of the participating readers illustrates how the transitional Ms. could speak both to a converted (i.e. resistant) audience as well as to those who still dismiss feminism as being the dogma of women who can't get men:

men:

> If I brought one of those [the older issues of Ms.] home it would just confirm all his [her father's] worst suspicions about me. But if I brought one of these [the new Ms.], they'd never know the difference. He'd let me get away with it. And to have them to say to him, "But, look, this is a feminist magazine," is then forcing him to rethink the image of feminism, not forcing me to change. (16)

In a sense, then, the "new" Ms. opens space within the dominant culture even as it closes some traditionally political representations. If struggle within hegemony can be characterized as a struggle between similarities and differences then Ms. certainly seems to be at the center of that tension. For even as Ms. worked to "normalize" those representations of women common in the dominant culture it also subtly resisted those codes by modifying the traditional posture of women photographed. Making a bid to "go commercial", to be a "market opportunity" as well as a "cause", has its subversive potential but it also has its risks. Going commercial may provide Ms. with greater recognition and thus a larger voice in the mass-media industry; it also may prevent Ms. from having whatever cutting edge it previously had.

What I think this analysis of the Ms. transition covers illustrates, however, is that even a seemingly dominant representation of women by Ms. is likely to have some subversive elements that upset or resist patriarchal capitalism. As Frederic Jameson explains in "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture", "the works of mass culture cannot be ideological without at one and the same time being implicitly or explicitly Utopian as well: they cannot manipulate unless they offer some genuine shred of content as a fantasy bribe to the public about

to be so manipulated." (17) That is, co-optation only works by fanning the flames of the very resistance it seeks to repress. In addition, oppositional strands remain within mass culture because the dominant meanings inscribed within it conflict with the real experiences--positive and negative--of cultural consumers. As John Fiske explains, the process of reading (or viewing) mass culture becomes one of negotiation, "in which the reader is an active maker of meanings from the text, not a passive recipient of already constructed ones." (18)

As feminist scholars interested in mass-media for women and in mass-media representations of women I think we need to continue to be sensitive to the complexities of cultural struggle within magazines like Ms. While we need to be able to recognize that the ideological often "overdetermines" and obscures the economic motives that shape mass-media we also need to be able to recognize the contradictions within the texts themselves and the potential for readers to resist inscribed meanings. Both the changes in "skin" and the changes in "heart" affect the way readers make meanings from texts. And each of these choices that magazines like Ms. make have important implications for those of us who need to see the oppositional possibilities within every move without excusing all changes as equally promising and oppositional.

FOOTNOTES

1. Geraldine Fabrikant, "Turn Around Sought At Ms. Magazine," New York Times, May 9, 1987, p. I39.

2. Suzanne Braun Levine, "The 'Ms. of the Future' Is Here," Ms., September, 1987, p. 5.

3. Fabrikant, New York Times, p. I37.

4. Maurine Christopher, "'Ms.'-givings Over Celebration", Advertising Age, July 13, 1987, p. 37. Indeed, many critics, including Adrienne Rich, have argued that Ms. sold out from the beginning. What I suggest, however, is that from the beginning Ms. was a complex enterprise, on the interface of consumer culture, mass-media, and feminism. While the dicates of the commerical market have constrained Ms., Ms. has also had to communicate a message to readers that somehow resonated with their experiences and expectations. More specifically, what I argue is that it is readers' demands and expectations of Ms. that have kept it a viable, somewhat open medium.

5. Louis Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays, trans. B. Brewster, (London: New Left Books, 1971).

6. Levine, Ms., p.5.

7. Fabrikant, New York Times, p. I37 and I39.

8. Fiske, John, "British Cultural Studies in Television", in Allen,ed., Channels of Discourse, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), p. 259.

9. Leslie Wayne, "Australia Concern to Buy Ms.", New York Times, September 24, 1987, p.D3.

10. Woman's Day, October 27, 1987.

11. Fiske, Channels, p.272.

12. Fiske, Channels, p. 272.

13. E. Ann Kaplan, "Feminist Criticism and Television," in Allen, ed., Channels of Discourse, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), p.221.

14. Theresa de Lauretis, Alice Doesn't, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), p. 57.

15. Fabrikant, New York Times, p. 38.

16. Group Interview, University of Minnesota, December 6, 1987.

17. Frederic Jameson, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture,"

Social Texts, Winter 1979, p. 144.

18. Fiske, Channels, p. 280.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert C., ed. Channels of Discourse, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

Althusser, Louis. Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. trans. B. Brewster, (London: New Left Books, 1971).

Bakhtin, M.M. The Dialogic Imagination. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press. 1981.

Barthes, Roland. Mythologies, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957).

Czitrom, Daniel J. Media and the American Mind: From Morse to McLuhan. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1982.

Christopher, Maurine, "'Ms.'-Givings Over Celebration," Advertising Age, July 13, 1987.

de Lauretis, Theresa, Alice Doesn't, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).

Fabrikant, Geraldine, "Turn Around Sought at Ms. Magazine", New York Times, May 9, 1987.

Group Interview, University of Minnesota, 6 December 1987.

Jameson, Frederic, "Reification and Utopia in Mass Culture," Social Texts, Winter 1979.

Levine, Suzanne Braun, "The 'Ms. of the Future' Is Here", Ms., September, 1987.

Mather, Anne. "A History of Feminist Periodicals." Journalism History 1 and 2. Autumn 1974, Winter 1974-75, Spring 1975.

Rich, Adrienne. On Lies, Secrets, and Silences. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 1979.

Steeves, H. Leslie, "Feminist Theories and Media Studies," Critical Studies in Mass Communication. Vol. 4, Number 7, June 1987.

Wayne, Leslie, "Australia Concern to Buy Ms.", New York Times, September 24, 1987.